arXiv:1403.5969v1 [cs.IT] 24 Mar 2014

RANDOM MATRICES AND ERASURE ROBUST FRAMES

YANG WANG

Abstract. Data erasure can often occur in communication. Guarding against erasures involves redundancy in data representation. Mathematically this may be achieved by redundancy through the use of frames. One way to measure the robustness of a frame against erasures is to examine the worst case condition number of the frame with a certain number of vectors erased from the frame. The term *numerically erasure-robust frames (NERFs)* was introduced in [9] to give a more precise characterization of erasure robustness of frames. In the paper the authors established that random frames whose entries are drawn independently from the standard normal distribution can be robust against up to approximately 15% erasures, and asked whether there exist frames that are robust against erasures of more than 50%. In this paper we show that with very high probability random frames are, independent of the dimension, robust against any amount of erasures as long as the number of remaining vectors is at least $1 + \delta$ times the dimension for some $\delta_0 > 0$. This is the best possible result, and it also implies that the proportion of erasures can arbitrarily close to 1 while still maintaining robustness. Our result depends crucially on a new estimate for the smallest singular value of a rectangular random matrix with independent standard normal entries.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbf{H}$ be a Hilbert space. A set of elements $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{f}_n\}$ in $\mathbf{H}$ (counting multiplicity) is called a *frame* if there exist two positive constants C_* and C^* such that for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{H}$ we have

$$C_*\|\mathbf{v}\|^2 \leq \sum_n |\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{f}_n\rangle|^2 \leq C^*\|\mathbf{v}\|^2. \tag{1.1}$$

The constants C_* and C^* are called the *lower frame bound* and the *upper frame bound*, respectively. A frame is called a *tight frame* if $C_* = C^*$. In this paper we focus mostly on real finite dimensional Hilbert spaces with $\mathbf{H} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{f}_n\}_{j=1}^N$, although we shall also discuss the extendability of the results to the complex case. Let $F = [\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{f}_N]$. It

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 42C15.

Key words and phrases. Random matrices, singular values, numerically erasure robust frame (NERF), condition number, restricted isometry property.

Yang Wang was supported in part by the National Science Foundation grant DMS-08135022 and DMS-1043032.

is called the *frame matrix* for $\mathcal{F}$. It is well known that $\mathcal{F}$ is a frame if and only if the $n \times N$ matrix F has rank n. Furthermore, the optimal frames bounds are given by

$$C_* = \sigma_n^2(F), \qquad C^* = \sigma_1^2(F),$$

where $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \cdots \sigma_n > 0$ are the singular values of F. Throughout this paper we shall identify without loss of generality a frame $\mathcal{F}$ by its frame matrix.

The main focus of the paper is on the *erasure robustness* property for a frame. This property arise in applications such as communication where data can be lost or corrupted in the process of transmission. Suppose that we have a frame F that is *full spark* in the sense that every n columns of F span $\mathbb{R}^n$, it is theoretically possible to erase up to $N - n$ data from the full set of data $\{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{f}_j \rangle\}_{j=1}^N$ while still reconstruct the signal $\mathbf{v}$. This is a simple consequence of the property that with the remaining available data $\{\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{f}_j \rangle\}_{j \in S}$ with $|S| \geq n$, $\mathbf{v}$ is uniquely determined because $\text{span}(\mathbf{f}_j : j \in S) = \mathbb{R}^n$. In practice, however, the condition number of the matrix $[\mathbf{f}_j]_{j \in S}$ could be so poor that the reconstruction is numerically unstable against the presence of additive noise in the data. Thus robustness against data loss and erasures is a highly desirable property for a frame. There have been a number of studies that aim to address this important issue.

Among the first studies of erasure-robust frames was given in [10]. It was shown in subsequent studies that that unit norm tight frames are optimally robust against one erasure [**?**] while Grassmannian frames are optimally robust against two erasures [16, 11]. The literature on erasure robustness for frames is quite extensive, see e.g. also [12, 18, 13]. In general, the robustness of a frame F against q-erasures, where $q \leq N - n$, is measured by the maximum of the condition numbers of all $n \times (N - q)$ submatrices of F. More precisely, let $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and let F_S denote the $n \times |S|$ submatrix of F with columns $\mathbf{f}_j$ for $j \in S$ (in its natural order, although the order of the columns is irrelevant). Then the robustness against q-erasures of F is measured by

$$R(F, q) := \max_{|S| = N - q} \frac{\sigma_1(F_S)}{\sigma_n(F_S)}. \tag{1.2}$$

Of course, the smaller $R(F, q)$ is the more robust F is against q-erasures. In [9], Fickus and Mixon coined the term *numerically erasure robust frame (NERF)*. A frame F is (K, α, β)-NERF if

$$\alpha \leq \sigma_n(F_S) \leq \sigma_1(F_S) \leq \beta \qquad \text{for any } S \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, N\},\ |S| = K.$$

Thus in this case $R(F, N-K) \leq \beta/\alpha$. Note that for any full spark $n \times N$ frame matrix F and any $n \leq K \leq N$ there always exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that F is (K, α, β)-NERF. The main goal is to find classes of frames where the bounds α, β, and more importantly, $R(F, N-K) = \beta/\alpha$, are independent of the dimension n while allowing the proportion of erasures $1 - \frac{K}{N}$ as large as possible. The authors studied in [9] the erasure robustness of $F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}A$, where the entries of A are independent random variables of the standard normal $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ distribution. It was shown that with high probability such a matrix can be good NERFs provided that K is no less than approximately 85% of N. The authors also proved that equiangular frame F in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with $N = n^2 - n + 1$ vectors is a good NERF against up to about 50% erasures. As far as the proportion of erasures is concerned this was the best known result for NERFs. However, the frame requires almost n^2 vectors. The authors posed as an open question whether there exist NERFs with $K < N/2$. A more recent paper [8] explored a deterministic construction based on certain group theoretic techniques. The approach offers more flexibility in the frame design than the far more restrictive equiangular frames.

In this paper we revisit the robustness of random frames. We provide a much stronger result for random frames, showing that for any $\delta > 0$, with very high probability, the frame $F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}A$ is a $((1+\delta)n, \alpha, \beta)$-NERF where α, β depend only on δ and the aspect ratio $\frac{N}{n}$. One version of our result is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}A$ where A is $n \times N$ whose entries are independent Gaussian random variables of $N(0,1)$ distribution. Let $\lambda = \frac{N}{n} > 1$. Then for any $0 < \delta_0 < \lambda - 1$ and $\tau_0 > 0$ there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending only on δ_0, λ and τ_0 such that for any $\delta_0 \leq \delta < \lambda - 1$, the frame F is a $((1+\delta)n, \alpha, \beta)$-NERF with probability at least $1 - e^{-\tau_0 n}$.*

Later in the paper we shall provide more implicit estimates for α, β that will allow us to easily compute them numerically. Note that our result is essentially the best possible, as we cannot go to $\delta_0 = 0$. A corollary of the theorem is that for random Gaussian frames the proportion of erasures $1 - \frac{K}{N}$ can be made arbitrary large while the frames still maintain robustness with overwhelming probability.

Our theorem depends crucially on a refined estimate on the smallest singular value of a random Gaussian matrix. There is a wealth of literature on random matrices. The study of singular values of random matrices has been particularly intense in recent years due

to their applications in compressive sensing for the construction of matrices with the so-called *restricted isometry property* (see e.g.[4, 5, 1, 2]). Random matrices have also been employed for phase retrieval [3], which aims to reconstruct a signal from the magnitudes of its samples. For a very informative and comprehensive survey of the subject we refer the readers to [15, 19], which also contains an extensive list of references (among the notable ones [7, 14, 17]). For the $n \times N$ Gaussian random matrix A the expected value of $\sigma_1(A)$ and $\sigma_n(A)$ are asymptotically $\sqrt{N} + \sqrt{n}$ and $\sqrt{N} - \sqrt{n}$, respectively. Many important results, such as the NERF analysis of random matrices in [9] as well as results on the restricted isometry property in compressive sensing, often utilize known estimates of $\sigma_1(A)$ and $\sigma_n(A)$ based on Hoeffding-type inequalities. One good such estimate is

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_n(A) < \sqrt{N} - \sqrt{n} - t\right) \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}, \tag{1.3}$$

see [19]. The problem with this estimate is that even by taking $t = \sqrt{N} - \sqrt{n}$ we only get a bound of $e^{-(\sqrt{\lambda}-1)^2 n/2}$ even though the probability in this case is 0. Thus estimates such as (1.3) that cap the decay rate are often inadequate. When applied to the erasure robustness problem for frames they usually put a cap on the proportion of erasures. To go further we must prove an estimate that will allow the exponent of decay to be much larger. We achieve this goal by proving the following theorem:

Theorem 1.2. *Let A be $n \times N$ whose entries are independent random variables of standard normal $N(0,1)$ distribution. Let $\lambda = \frac{N}{n} > 1$. Then for any $\mu > 0$ there exist constants $c, C > 0$ depending only on μ and λ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(c\sqrt{n} \leq \sigma_n(A) \leq \sigma_1(A) \leq C\sqrt{n}\right) \geq 1 - 3e^{-\mu n}. \tag{1.4}$$

Furthermore, we may take $C = 1 + \sqrt{\lambda} + \sqrt{\mu}$ and $c = \sup_{0<t<1} \varphi(t)$ where

$$\varphi(t) = \frac{t^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}}{L} - \frac{2Ct}{1-t}, \qquad \text{where} \qquad L = \sqrt{\frac{2e}{\lambda}} e^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda}}. \tag{1.5}$$

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Radu Balan and Dustin Mixon for very helpful discussions.

2. Smallest Singular Value of a Random Matrix: Nonasymptotic Estimate

We begin with estimates on the extremal singular values of a ranodm matrix A whose entries are independent standard normal random variables. We shall assume throughout

the section that A is $n \times N$ where $\frac{N}{n} = \lambda > 1$. One of the very important estimates is

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_1(A) > \sqrt{N} + \sqrt{n} + t\right) \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}, \tag{2.1}$$

see [19]. Our main goal of this section is to prove the estimates for smallest singular value $\sigma_n(A)$ stated in Theorem 1.2. An equivalent formulation of (2.1) is

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_1(A) > C\sqrt{n}\right) \leq e^{-\frac{(C-1-\sqrt{\lambda})^2}{2}n}, \qquad C \geq 1 + \sqrt{\lambda}. \tag{2.2}$$

Observe that

$$\sigma_n(A) = \min_{\mathbf{v} \in S^{n-1}} \|A^*\mathbf{v}\|,$$

where S^{n-1} denotes the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $c > 0$. For any $\mathbf{v} \in S^{n-1}$ the probability $\mathbb{P}(\|A^*\mathbf{v}\| \leq c)$ is independent of the choice of $\mathbf{v}$. We have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{v}\| \leq \sqrt{\delta n}\right) \leq \left(\frac{2e\delta}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{N}{2}} \tag{2.3}$$

for any $\delta > 0$.

Proof. The fact that $\mathbb{P}(\|A^*\mathbf{v}\| \leq c)$ is independent of the choice of $\mathbf{v}$ is a well know fact, which stems from the fact that the entries of PA are again independent standard normal random variables for any orthogonal $n \times n$ matrix P. In particular, one can always find an orthogonal P such that $P\mathbf{v} = e_1$. Thus we may without loss of generality take $\mathbf{v} = e_1$. In this case $\|A^*\mathbf{v}\|^2 = a_{11}^2 + \cdots + a_{1N}^2$ where $[a_{11}, \ldots, a_{1N}]$ denotes the first row of A. Denote $Y_N = a_{11}^2 + \cdots + a_{1N}^2$. Then Y_N has the $\Gamma(\frac{N}{2}, 1)$ distribution, which has the density function

$$\rho(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{N}{2})} e^{-t} t^{\frac{N}{2}-1}, \quad t > 0.$$

Denote $m = \frac{N}{2}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{v}\| \leq \sqrt{\delta n}\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(Y_N \leq \delta n\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(m)} \int_0^{\delta n} e^{-t} t^{m-1} dt \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(m)} \int_0^{\delta n} t^{m-1} dt \\
&= \frac{\delta^m n^m}{\Gamma(m)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Gamma(m) \geq (\frac{m}{e})^m$ by Stirling's formula. The theorem now follows from $\frac{N}{n} = \lambda$ and $m = \frac{N}{2}$. ∎

A ubiquitous tool in the study of random matrices is an ε-net. F or any $\varepsilon > 0$ an ε-net for S^{n-1} is a set in S^{n-1} such that any point on S^{n-1} is no more than ε distance away from the set. The following result is known and can be found in [19]:

Lemma 2.2. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an ε-net $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ in S^{n-1} with cardinality no larger than $(1 + 2\varepsilon^{-1})^n$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Assume that $\sigma_n(A) = b\sqrt{n}$. Then there exists a $\mathbf{v}_0 \in S^{n-1}$ such that $\|A^*\mathbf{v}_0\| = b\sqrt{n}$. Let $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ be an ε-net for S^{n-1} and take $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ that is the closest to $\mathbf{v}_0$. So $\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_0\| \leq \varepsilon$. Thus

$$\|A^*\mathbf{u}\| \leq \|A^*\mathbf{v}_0\| + \|A^*(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}_0)\| \leq b\sqrt{n} + \varepsilon\sigma_1(A). \tag{2.4}$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_n(A) \leq c\sqrt{n}\right) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{u}\in\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} \mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{u}\| \leq c\sqrt{n} + \varepsilon\sigma_1(A)\right). \tag{2.5}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{u}\| \leq c\sqrt{n} + \varepsilon\sigma_1(A)\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{u}\| \leq c\sqrt{n} + \varepsilon\sigma_1(A), \sigma_1(A) \leq C\sqrt{n}\right)\\ &+ \mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{u}\| \leq c\sqrt{n} + \varepsilon\sigma_1(A), \sigma_1(A) > C\sqrt{n}\right).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.1 the first term on the right hand side is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{u}\| \leq c\sqrt{n} + \varepsilon\sigma_1(A), \sigma_1(A) \leq C\sqrt{n}\right)\\ &\qquad \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{u}\| \leq c\sqrt{n} + \varepsilon C\sqrt{n}\right) \leq \Big(\frac{2e(c + \varepsilon C)^2}{\lambda}\Big)^{\frac{N}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

By (2.2) the second term on the right hand side is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{u}\| \leq c\sqrt{n} + \varepsilon\sigma_1(A), \sigma_1(A) > C\sqrt{n}\right)\\ &\qquad \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_1(A) > C\sqrt{n}\right) \leq e^{-\frac{(C-1-\sqrt{\lambda})^2}{2}n}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus combining these two upper bounds we obtain the estimate

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_n(A) \leq c\sqrt{n}\right) \leq \Big(1 + \frac{2}{\varepsilon}\Big)^n \left(\Big(\frac{2e(c + \varepsilon C)^2}{\lambda}\Big)^{\frac{N}{2}} + e^{-\frac{(C-1-\sqrt{\lambda})^2}{2}n}\right). \tag{2.6}$$

We would like to bound $\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_n(A) \leq c\sqrt{n}\right)$ by $2e^{-\mu n}$. All we need then is to choose $\varepsilon, c, C > 0$ so that both upper bound terms in (2.6) are bounded by $e^{-\mu n}$. Note that

$\frac{N}{2} = \frac{\lambda}{2}n$. Hence we only need

$$-\mu \geq \ln(1+2\varepsilon^{-1}) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\Big(\ln 2e - \ln\lambda + 2\ln(c+\varepsilon C)\Big), \tag{2.7}$$

$$-\mu \geq -\frac{1}{2}(C-1-\sqrt{\lambda})^2. \tag{2.8}$$

The equation (2.8) leads to the condition

$$C \geq \sqrt{2\mu} + \sqrt{\lambda} + 1. \tag{2.9}$$

To meet condition (2.7) we set $c = r\varepsilon$. Then $\ln(c+\varepsilon C) = -\ln\varepsilon^{-1} + \ln(r+C)$. Thus (2.7) becomes

$$(\lambda-1)\ln(\varepsilon^{-1}) \geq \mu + \ln(2+\varepsilon) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\ln\Big(\frac{2e(r+C)^2}{\lambda}\Big). \tag{2.10}$$

Clearly, once we fix C and r, say, take $C = \sqrt{2\mu} + \sqrt{\lambda} + 1$ and $r = 1$, $\ln\varepsilon^{-1}$ will be greater than the right hand side of (2.10) for small enough ε because of the condition $\lambda > 1$. Both C, c only depend on λ and μ. The existence part of the theorem is thus proved.

While we have already a good explicit estimate $C = \sqrt{2\mu}+\sqrt{\lambda}+1$, it remains to establish the explicit formula for c. For any fixed r the largest ε is achieved when (2.10) is an equality, namely

$$(\lambda-1)\ln(\varepsilon^{-1}) = \mu + \ln(2+\varepsilon) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\ln\Big(\frac{2e(r+C)^2}{\lambda}\Big),$$

which one can rewrite as

$$\ln(r+C) = -(1-p)\ln\varepsilon - p\ln(2+\varepsilon) - \ln L,$$

where $p = \lambda^{-1}$ and $L = \sqrt{\frac{2e}{\lambda}}e^{\frac{\mu}{\lambda}}$. It follows that

$$r\varepsilon = \frac{1}{L}\Big(\frac{\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}\Big)^p - C\varepsilon = \frac{1}{L}t^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} - \frac{2Ct}{1-t},$$

where $t = \frac{\varepsilon}{2+\varepsilon}$. Note that $0 < t < 1$. Now we can take c to be the supreme value of $r\varepsilon$, which yields

$$c = \sup_{0<t<1}\Big\{\frac{t^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}}{L} - \frac{2Ct}{1-t}\Big\}. \tag{2.11}$$

Finally, (1.4) follows from $\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_n(A) \leq c\sqrt{n}\right) \leq 2e^{-\mu n}$ and (2.2). The proof of the theorem is now complete. ∎

Remark. Although there does not seem to exist an explicit formula for c given in (2.11), there is a very good explicit approximation of it. In general, the t that maximize $\varphi(t)$ is

rather small. So we may approximate $\frac{2Ct}{1-t}$ simply by $2Ct$ and find the maximum of

$$\tilde{\varphi}(t) = \frac{1}{L} t^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} - 2Ct. \tag{2.12}$$

The maximum of $\tilde{\varphi}(t)$ is obtained at $t_0 = (2C\lambda L)^{-\frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1}}$. This t_0 is very close to the actual t that maximizes $\varphi(t)$. Thus

$$\tilde{c} := \varphi(t_0) = \Big(\frac{1}{2C\lambda L^{\lambda}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{\lambda-1}} \Big(1 - \frac{1}{\lambda}\Big) \tag{2.13}$$

has $\tilde{c} \leq c$ and it is a close approximation of the optimal c. Of course, Theorem 1.2 still holds when c is replaced by $\tilde{c}$.

Although Theorem 1.2 is for real Gaussian random matrices, a complex version of it can also be proved with minor modifications. A complex random variable $Z = X + iY$ has the *complex standard normal* distribution if both X and Y have the real complex normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Theorem 1.2 extends to the following theorem for the complex case:

Theorem 2.3. *Let A be $n \times N$ whose entries are independent random variables of complex standard normal $N(0, 1)$ distribution. Let $\lambda = \frac{N}{n} > 1$. Then for any $\mu > 0$ there exist constants $c, C > 0$ depending only on μ and λ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(c\sqrt{n} \leq \sigma_n(A) \leq \sigma_1(A) \leq C\sqrt{n}\right) \geq 1 - 3e^{-\mu n}. \tag{2.14}$$

Furthermore, we may take $C = \sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{\lambda} + 2\sqrt{\mu}$ and $c = \sup_{0<t<1} \varphi(t)$ where

$$\varphi(t) = \frac{t^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}}{L} - \frac{2Ct}{1-t}, \qquad \text{where} \qquad L = \sqrt{\frac{2e}{\lambda}} e^{\frac{\mu}{2\lambda}}. \tag{2.15}$$

Proof. The proof follows the same argument as in the real case so we only sketch the proof here. In particular we point out the places where the estimates need to be modified.

Write $A = A_R + iA_I$ and set $B = [A_R, A_I]$. Then B is an $n \times 2N$ matrix whose entries are independent real standard normal random variables. It is easy to check that $\sigma_1(A) \leq \sqrt{2}\sigma_1(B)$. Thus by taking $C = 2\sqrt{\lambda} + \sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{\mu}$ we have via (2.1) that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sigma_1(A) \leq C\sqrt{n}\right) \leq e^{-\mu n}. \tag{2.16}$$

The estimate for $\sigma_n(A)$ follows from the same strategy as in the real case. First of all, just like the real case for any $n \times n$ unitary matrix U the entries of UA are still independed complex standard normal random variables. As a result the probability $\mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{v}\| \leq \sqrt{\delta n}\right)$ where $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is a unit vector does not depend on the choice of $\mathbf{v}$. By taking $\mathbf{v} = e_1$ we see

that ($\|A^*\mathbf{v}\|^2$ has the $\Gamma(N,1)$ distribution (as opposed to the $\Gamma(\frac{N}{2},1)$ distribution in the real case). Applying Lemma 2.1 we obtain the equivalent result for the complex case in

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|A^*\mathbf{v}\| \leq \sqrt{\delta n}\right) \leq \left(\frac{2e\delta}{\lambda}\right)^N. \tag{2.17}$$

Next for the ε-net, we observe that the unit sphere in $\mathbb{C}^n$ is precisely the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ if we identify $\mathbb{C}^n$ as $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Thus we can find an ε-net $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ of cardinality no more than $(1+2\varepsilon^{-1})^{2n}$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 now goes through with some minor modifications. The most important one is that with (2.16) and (2.17) the inequality condition (2.7) now becomes

$$-\frac{\mu}{2} \geq \ln(1+2\varepsilon^{-1}) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\Big(\ln 2e - \ln\lambda + 2\ln(c+\varepsilon C)\Big),$$

where the constant C is changed to $C = 2\sqrt{\lambda} + \sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{\mu}$. Substituting this C and $\frac{\mu}{2}$ for μ we prove the theorem. ∎

3. Random Frames as NERFs

Our goal in this section is to establish the robustness of random frames against erasures by proving Theorem 1.1. Here we restate Theorem 1.1 in a a different form for the benefit of simpler notation in the proof.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}A$ where A is $n \times N$ whose entries are drawn independently from the standard normal $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ distribution. Let $\lambda = \frac{N}{n} > 1$ and $K = pN = p\lambda n$ where $\lambda^{-1} < p \leq 1$. For any $\tau_0 > 0$ there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending only on λ, p and τ_0 such that F is a (K,α,β)-NERF with probability at least $1 - 3e^{-\tau_0 n}$.*

Proof. There exists exactly $\frac{N!}{K!(N-K)!}$ subsets $S \subseteq \{1,2,\ldots,N\}$ of cardinality $|S| = K$. It is well known that

$$\frac{N!}{K!(N-K)!} \leq \frac{N^N}{K^K(N-K)^{N-K}},$$

which can be shown easily by Stirling's Formula or induction on N. Set $s_p = p\ln p^{-1} + (1-p)\ln(1-p)^{-1}$, which has $0 \leq s_p \leq \ln 2$. We have then

$$\frac{N!}{K!(N-K)!} \leq \left(p^{-p}(1-p)^{p-1}\right)^N = e^{\lambda s_p n}. \tag{3.1}$$

Now we set $\mu := \lambda s_p + \tau_0$. Let $C = \sqrt{2\mu} + \sqrt{p\lambda} + 1$ and $c = \sup_{0<t<1}\varphi(t)$ where $\varphi(t)$ is given in (1.5). Let the columns of A be $\{\mathbf{a}_j\}_{j=1}^N$. For any $S \subseteq \{1,2,\ldots,N\}$ we denote by

A_S the submatrix of A whose columns are $\{\mathbf{f}_j : \ j \in S\}$. Then for $|S| = K = p\lambda n$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(c\sqrt{n} \le \sigma_n(A_S) \le \sigma_1(A_S) \le C\sqrt{n}\right) \ge 1 - 3e^{-\mu n}.$$

by Theorem 1.2. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big(\sigma_n(A_S) \le c\sqrt{n} \text{ or } \sigma_1(A_S) \ge C\sqrt{n} \text{ for some } S \text{ with } |S| = K\Big) \\ \le \sum_{|S|=K} \mathbb{P}\Big(\sigma_n(A_S) \le c\sqrt{n} \text{ or } \sigma_1(A_S) \ge C\sqrt{n}\Big) \\ \le 3e^{(\lambda s_p - \mu)n} \ = \ 3e^{-\tau_0 n}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(c\sqrt{n} \le \sigma_n(A_S) \le \sigma_1(A_S) \le C\sqrt{n} \text{ for all } S \text{ with } |S| = K\Big) \ge 1 - 3e^{\tau_0 n}.$$

This implies that, by setting $\alpha = c$ and $\beta = C$, $F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}A$ is a (K, α, β)-NERF with probability at least $1 - 3e^{-\tau_0 n}$. ∎

Theorems 1.1 and 3.1 states that random Gaussian frames can be robust with overwhelming probability against erasures of an arbitrary proportion of data from the original data, at least in theory, as long as the number of remaining vectors is at least $(1 + \delta_0)n$ for some $\delta_0 > 0$. In practice one may ask how good the condition numbers are if the erasures reach a high proportion, say, 90% of the data. We show some numerical results below.

Example 1. Let $F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}A$ where A is $n \times N$ whose entries are independent standard normal random variables. Set $\tau_0 = 0.25$. In this experiment we fix $K = 2n$ and $K = 5n$, respectively, and let N vary. As N increases from $N = K$ to $N = 100K$ the proportion of erasure $s = 1 - \frac{K}{N}$ increases from 0 to 99%. We shall use β/α as a measure of robustness since it is an upper bound for the condition number. Clearly, as s increases we should expect β/α to increase. The left plot in Figure 1 shows $\log_2(\beta/\alpha)$ against s for both $K = 2n$ (top curve) and $K = 5n$ (bottom curve). Because the frame is normalized so that each column is on average a unit norm vector, it also makes sense to use the smallest singular value as a measurement of robustness. The right plot in Figure 1 shows $-\log_2(\alpha)$ against s also for both $K = 2n$ (top curve) and $K = 5n$ (bottom curve). Our numerical results show that in the case $K = 2n$, with probability at least $1 - 3e^{-0.5n}$, the condition number is no more than 10232 for 50% erasures and no more than 611675 for 90% erasures. In the case



FIGURE 1. Left: $\log_2(\beta/\alpha)$ against the proportion of erasures when N varies from K to $100K$ while K is fixed at $K = 2n$ (top curve) and $K = 5n$ (bottom curve). Right: Same as in the left figure, but for $-\log_2(\alpha)$.

$K = 5n$, the corresponding numbers are 139.88 and 1862.1, respectively. In fact, even with 99% erasures the condition number is no more than 42716.

Example 2. Again we let $F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}A$ where A is $n \times N$ whose entries are independent standard normal random variables, and let $\tau_0 = 0.25$. In this experiment we fix $N = 200n$ and $N = 50n$, respectively, and let K vary so the proportion of erasures $s = 1 - \frac{K}{N}$ varies from 0 to 99% ($N = 200n$ and 0 to 97% ($N = 50n$), respectively. Again we should expect the robustness to go down as we increase s. The left plot in Figure 2 shows $\log_2(\beta/\alpha)$ against s for $N = 50n$ (top curve) and $N = 200n$ (bottom curve). The right plot in Figure 2 shows $-\log_2(\alpha)$ against s also for both $N = 50n$ (top curve) and $N = 200n$ (bottom curve). Our numerical results show that in the case $N = 50n$, with probability at least $1 - 3e^{-0.5n}$, the condition number is no more than 31.7 for 50% erasures and 1862.1 for 90% erasures. In the case $N = 200n$, the corresponding numbers are 23.48 and 315.12, respectively. Even with 95% erasures the condition number is no more than 1312.4.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Baraniuk, M. Davenport, R. DeVore, and M. Wakin. A simple proof of the restricted isometry property for random matrices. *Constructive Approximation*, 28(3):253–263, 2008.

[2] E.J. Candès. The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing. *Comptes Rendus Mathematique*, 346(9):589–592, 2008.



FIGURE 2. Left: $\log_2(\beta/\alpha)$ against the proportion of erasures when K varies while N is fixed at $N = 50n$ (top curve) and $N = 200n$ (bottom curve). Right: Same as in the left figure, but for $-\log_2(\alpha)$.

[3] E.J. Candes, Y. Eldar, T. Strohmer, and V. Voroninski. Phase retrieval via matrix completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.0573*, 2011.

[4] E.J. Candes and T. Tao. Decoding by linear programming. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 51(12):4203–4215, 2005.

[5] E.J. Candes and T. Tao. Near-optimal signal recovery from random projections: Universal encoding strategies? *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 52(12):5406–5425, 2006.

[6] P.G. Casazza and J. Kovačević. Equal-norm tight frames with erasures. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 18(2):387–430, 2003.

[7] A. Edelman. Eigenvalues and condition numbers of random matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 9(4):543–560, 1988.

[8] M. Fickus, J. Jasper, D.G. Mixon, and J. Peterson. Group-theoretic constructions of erasure-robust frames. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.0139*, 2012.

[9] M. Fickus and D.G. Mixon. Numerically erasure-robust frames. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 2012.

[10] V.K. Goyal, J. Kovačević, and J.A. Kelner. Quantized frame expansions with erasures. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 10(3):203–233, 2001.

[11] R.B. Holmes and V.I. Paulsen. Optimal frames for erasures. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 377:31–51, 2004.

[12] J. Kovacevic, P.L. Dragotti, and V.K. Goyal. Filter bank frame expansions with erasures. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 48(6):1439–1450, 2002.

[13] M. Puschel and J. Kovacevic. Real, tight frames with maximal robustness to erasures. In *Data Compression Conference, 2005. Proceedings. DCC 2005*, pages 63–72. IEEE, 2005.

[14] M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin. Smallest singular value of a random rectangular matrix. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 62(12):1707–1739, 2009.

[15] M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin. Non-asymptotic theory of random matrices: extreme singular values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1003.2990*, 2010.

[16] T. Strohmer and R.W. Heath. Grassmannian frames with applications to coding and communication. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 14(3):257–275, 2003.

[17] T. Tao and V. Vu. Random matrices: The distribution of the smallest singular values. *Geometric And Functional Analysis*, 20(1):260–297, 2010.

[18] R. Vershynin. Frame expansions with erasures: an approach through the non-commutative operator theory. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 18(2):167–176, 2005.
[19] R. Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*, 2010.

Department of Mathematics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

E-mail address: ywang@math.msu.edu